

A. Claim 11

Applicant submits that claim 11 is patentable over the cited references. For example, claim 11 recites that the job request section sends a job request to the host computer according to a condition of the print engine and the receive buffer memory.

The Examiner maintains that Gase discloses a job request section (i.e., browser 26 of printer 14), but acknowledges that Gase fails to disclose that the alleged job request section 26 sends a job request to a host computer *according to* a condition of the print engine and receive buffer memory of a printer. The Examiner, however, contends that Zimmerman does disclose such a feature. In particular, the Examiner refers to column 5 of Zimmerman regarding the processing of a print job according to a condition of a receive buffer memory and a print engine. As set forth in the November 2, 2004 Amendment, it is the host computer 10 of Zimmerman that determines the data transfer rate over the I/O 14 and sets the printer's buffer threshold based on the known speed of the print engine 34 (col. 5, lines 39-44). Therefore, any actions based on a condition of the print engine 34 and the I/O buffer RAM portions 40, 42 (alleged buffer memory), are taken by the host computer 10, not by a printer. On page 13 of the current Office Action, the Examiner acknowledges that Zimmerman teaches that it is the "host computer" that sends a print job to the printer based on certain conditions.

In view of the above, and assuming the Examiner's proffered motivation is proper, the modification of Gase, by the specific teaching of Zimmerman, would result in the host computers 10, 12, etc. of Gase having a function of determining a data transfer rate over an I/O line and setting a buffer of printer 14 based on the known speed of a print engine of the printer 14. Since

Zimmerman fails to disclose such a feature being provided in a printer, the alleged combination would not result in the modification of Gase's printer 14 itself, rather, just modification of the host computers, as set forth.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that even if combined, the references fail to teach or suggest the claimed features. In particular, there is no teaching or suggestion, in Zimmerman, to provide the function of host computer 10 in its own printer 12, let alone the printer 14 of Gase.

In regard to the concept of a "dumb" printer and an "intelligent" printer, Applicant provides the following comments. As to a dumb printer, a printer driver installed in a host computer processes a print data to be printed and monitors and controls conditions of the printer. Thus, the transmission rate has to be decided at the host computer side by monitoring the condition of the printer, and the printer merely functions as a slave terminal. The printer disclosed in Zimmerman corresponds to a dumb printer.

On the other hand, an intelligent printer has font data and language for processing the image data and performs a part of the function of the printer driver which is installed in the host computer. Thus, a part of image processing is performed by the printer side. However, the printer always only prints under the initiative of the host computer (or a print server) and cannot spontaneously printer (i.e., cannot execute a print job set by a printer at a time set by the printer). The printer discussed in the background section of the present Application and the printer of Gase correspond to an intelligent printer.

The printer of an illustrative, non-limiting embodiment of the present invention corresponds to an intelligent printer with the added ability of being able to control an amount of received jobs stored in a buffer memory of the printer (i.e., a job request section of the printer sends a job request to the host computer according to a condition of the print engine and the receive buffer memory).

Based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 11 is patentable over the cited references.

B. Claims 12 and 13

Since claims 12 and 13 are dependent upon claim 11, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

C. Claims 16, 17 and 18

Since claim 16 contains features which are analogous to the features recited in claim 11, Applicant submits that claim 16 is patentable for at least analogous reasons as presented above. In addition, since claims 17 and 18 are dependent upon claim 16, Applicant submits that such claims are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

II. Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Gase in view of Zimmerman.

Claims 14, 15, 19 and 20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gase in view of Zimmerman and Pipeline Corporation (column 1, lines 48-60

of Gase). However, since claims 14, 15, 19 and 20 are dependent upon claims 11 and 16, respectively, and Pipeline fails to cure the deficient teachings of Gase and Zimmerman, in regard to claims 11 and 16, Applicant submits that claims 14, 15, 19 and 20 are patentable at least by virtue of their dependency.

In addition, Applicant submits that claims 14, 15, 19 and 20 are patentable for at least analogous reasons as set forth in the April 20, 2004 Amendment. For example, claim 14 recites that a job request section can specify a desired part of job data when the job request section sends a job request to a host computer. In response, the host computer sends (i.e., the printing section receives) only the desired part of the job data.

The Examiner acknowledges that Gase fails to teach or suggest the above features, but contends that Pipeline does. However, Pipeline just discloses that a printer can be programmed to retrieve and print pages that are hyperlinked to an original document of a website (col. 1, lines 57-60). As noted above, claim 14 recites that the claimed job request section can specify a desired part of the job data, where the job data is data generated from a print job (i.e. due to claim 14's dependency on claim 11). Pipeline fails to disclose that the "original document" is the job data (i.e. data generated from a print job), such that the hyperlinked pages are a "desired part" of the job data. Rather, since the reference discloses that the printer is "programmed" to retrieve the hyperlinked pages, it appears that the hyperlinked pages actually form the job data (i.e. the portion specified or programmed by a user to be printed). Thus, the reference fails to teach or suggest that the printer can specify a desired part of the alleged job data (i.e. a desired part of the specified hyperlinked pages).


Response under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116
U.S. Application No. 09/353,383

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claim 14 is patentable over the combination of the cited references. Since claims 15, 19 and 20 contain analogous features as claim 14, Applicant submits that they are patentable for at least analogous reasons.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Allison M. Tulino
Registration No. 48,294

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: November 23, 2005